UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,190	07/15/2003	Gustaaf Persoons	FMCNV121470	2343	
26389 7590 08/28/2007 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER		
			THAKUR, VIREN A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1761		
				E. 400.	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/621,190	PERSOONS, GUSTAAF	
Examiner	Art Unit	_
Viren Thakur	1761	

	Viren Thakur	1761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
HE REPLY FILED 07 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7.	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>07 August 2007</u> . A brid the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS	or any extension thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		timely filed amondmy	ant concoling the				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	nowabie ii submitted in a separate,	umely med amendine	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ill be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below of appended.						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,13-16,19-24,27 and 28</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,13-10,19-24,27 and 25.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.							

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The amendment to the claims has overcome the rejection of claims 1, 13-16, 19-24 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to Taylor have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Wong is relied on as evidence of the broad spectrum activity of nisin. That is, nisin inhibited various species and strains in the genera Staphylococcus, Streptococcus, Neisseria, Bacillius, Clostridium and Corynebacterium. This provides the evidence of the properties of nisin which would make it capable of inhibiting bacteria other than only C.Botulinum. Taylor also provides evidence that nisin has the ability to inhibit different botulinum spores from different culture and type sources (Column 1, Line 63 to COlumn 2, Line 9). Therefore, nisin would inherently have inhibited a broad range of bacteria thus providing increased shelf life of the product. The Office has provided the evidence that nisin would inhibit against a broad range of bacteria, as evidenced by Wong. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Talyor (US 4597972) and the arguments are taken as cited in the final rejection.

Applicants' arguments with respect to Walker et al. have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. As stated in the final rejection, simply because the solution in which the shellfish meat of Walker et al. is placed has a pH of between about 3 and 5 would not lower the pH of the food to 5 or below. THe cited evidence to the US Food and Drug Administration, Approximate pH of Foods and Food products recites the pH of crabmeat at between 6.5 and 7. Therefore, it would have been known to the skilled artisan that a 3 percent solution of an acid having a pH of 5, for example, would not lower the pH of the meat to below 5. Claim 1 of Walker et al. disclose wherein the aqueous solution within which the shellfish meat is placed has a pH of less than about 5. This is the pH of the aqueous solution and not the pH of the food product. The rejection and arguments are taken as cited in the final rejection.

KETTH HENDRICKS PRIMARY EXAMINER